

Application No. 10/813,096  
Amendment dated July 24, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 24, 2007

Docket No.: 2519-0295PUS1

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 24 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-7, 11, 14 and 15 have been amended and claims 1-17 remain pending in the present application. Support for the amendments is found in the specification and claims as filed. Accordingly, the amendments do not constitute the addition of new matter. Reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and following comments is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "non-electrical memory," as recited in claims 1, 7 and 14.

As will be seen by the above amendments, claims 1, 7 and 14 have been amended to replace the term "non-electrical memory" with the term "non-volatile memory," for which the specification provides proper antecedent basis. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the specification be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Junod (Patent Number 5,854,621) in view of Maeda (Pub. No. US 2004/0005052). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Of the rejected claims 1-17, only claims 1, 7 and 14 are independent.

As stated above, claims 1, 7 and 14 have been amended to replace the term "non-

Application No. 10/813,096  
Amendment dated July 24, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 24, 2007

Docket No.: 2519-0295PUS1

electrical memory" with the term "non-volatile memory". At least, Junod in view of Maeda fails to disclose those features regarding "non-volatile memory" recited in amended claims 1, 7 and 14. Accordingly, the novel features of amended claims 1, 7 and 14 produce new and unexpected results and hence are unobvious and patentable over these references.

In addition, claims 2-6 depend from claim 1, claims 8-13 depend from claim 7, and claims 15-17 depend from claim 14 and add further limitations thereto. Thus, claims 2-6, 8-13 and 15-17 are also believed to be novel and unobvious over the prior art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.


Application No. 10/813,096  
Amendment dated July 24, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of April 24, 2007

Docket No.: 2519-0295PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 24, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Joe McKinney Muncy  
Registration No.: 32,334  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant